

REMARKS

The amendments to the claims find support in the specification and claims as originally filed, for example, at page 5, lines 13-16 and 19-22; page 6, lines 1-2; page 7, lines 8-22; page 9, lines 1-6; page 12, line 4- page 13, line 7; in Figures 2-7, and elsewhere in the application as originally filed.

No new matter is added by way of the amendments.

Claim 4 is deleted without prejudice and disclaimer.

Claims 1-20 have been examined and stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly unclear. Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's statement that claims 1 and 15, and 2-14 and 16-20 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to replace the word "which" with the words "said panels whose," to recite the ratio of "50 to 1," and no longer include the phrase "rotate the member itself" in accordance with the comments of the Examiner.

Claim 2 has been amended and now recites "connected to each other."

Claim 3 has been amended to replace the word "each" with the phrase "the at least one."

Claim 5 has been amended to no longer refer to "line segments" but instead to a plurality of straight segments as illustrated in Fig. 5.

Claim 8 has been amended to delete the words "their" and "whole" objected to by the Examiner.

Claim 9 no longer recites the word "its" objected to by the Examiner and instead recites "one surrounding side panel" as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 11 no longer begins with the words “The connecting members” and has been amended substantially as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 12 now refers to said side panels and is believed to be clear and in accordance with the base claim.

Claim 14 has been amended as suggested to explicitly note that the ratio is with respect to 1, and that the side panels are made of a material having a ductile feature with a ductility much less than that of the at least one plastically stretched connecting member.

Claims 15 and 16 have been amended to recite “perimeter bar” instead of the “perimeter bars” objected to by the Examiner.

Claims 19 and 20 have been amended in the manner of the amendments to claims 11 and 9, respectively, as suggested by the Examiner.

Applicants submit that the claims are clear and not indefinite. Accordingly, Applicants believe the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance, and request their reconsideration and allowance. Early notification of the allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below should he find that there are any further issues outstanding.

Although no fees are believed to be due at this time, please charge any fees, including any fees for extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-1641 referencing Attorney's Docket No. 22877-5043.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 29, 2006

By:



James A. Fox, Ph.D. (Reg. No. 38,455)

Heller Ehrman LLP
275 Middlefield Road
Menlo Park, California 94025
Direct Dial: (650) 324-6951
Telephone: (650) 324-7000
Facsimile: (650) 324-6654